

REMARKS

In the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner has objected to claims 1-13 requiring correction of the term "characterized" to "comprising" or "wherein." Applicant has amended the claims so that the objected to term has been deleted and "wherein" inserted in its place.

Claims 1, 9-11 and 13 have been rejected as unpatentable over JP-07-055308 in view of Rankin. Applicant has amended the claims so that they now recite that one of the injection holes is always facing and pressed against the inner peripheral surface of the pipe. This is not shown in either of JP-07-055308 or Rankin. The Examiner has stated that one of ordinary skill in the art would have expected that the position of the nozzle injection holes would ensure that the nozzle will not be centrally located within a pipe and that nozzle is pressed against the interior wall of the pipe. However, there is no suggestion or disclosure that it is desirable to always face a specific injection hole to the inner peripheral surface of the pipe to which it is pressed. Accordingly, since there is no teaching or suggestion in the art to do such, nor is there any indication in the art that such would be desirable, it cannot be obvious in view of such art.

Claims 3-4 have been rejected as unpatentable over JP-07-055308 in view of Rankin and Folts et al. The Examiner has stated that it would have been obvious to incorporate the nozzle of Folts et al. into the process of JP-07-055308 to increase the area of the injection nozzle into the drainpipe. Applicant has amended claims 3 and 4 so that they now recite that a specific injection hole is always facing and pressed against the inner peripheral surface of the pipe. This is not found in either of the cited references. By this amendment, Applicant is clarifying the positioning of the specific injection hole as adjacent to and facing the inner surface of the pipe. Each of the other references show that the injection hole, or holes, are generally oriented toward the open spaces of the pipe spread against the distal surface. By being always facing and pressed against the inner surface of the pipe, Applicant's nozzle can directly impact the

US 10/ 807,923

solid material adhering to the interior surface of the pipe and thus have more impact and washing efficiency.

Claims 5-8 and 10 have been rejected as unpatentable over JP-07-055308 in view of Rankin, Folts et al and Iida et al. Iida teaches an endoscope system which utilizes a cleaning solution carried to all the flow paths of the internal conduits for cleaning action. Iida et al. relies on a sufficient flow speed within the channel to clean the internal conduits. There is no suggestion to combine the cleaning solution of Iida et al. with a method such as that of Applicant's in washing drain pipe which relies on action from the nozzle in conjunction with the high pressure water to produce an abrasion. As a result, there would be no suggestion to combine the pipe washing nozzle of JP-07-055308 with the retractable rotating hose of Rankin, the nozzle of Folts et al. and the cleaning solution of Iida et al.

In addition, Applicant has amended claims 5 and 8 to more particularly clarify the concept of orienting a specific injection hole so that it is always facing and pressed against the inner peripheral surface of the pipe. As stated above, this is not shown in any of the art of record.

Applicant hereby requests reconsideration and reexamination thereof.

With the above amendments and remarks, this application is considered ready for allowance and applicant earnestly solicits an early notice of same. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of the subject application, he is respectfully requested to call the undersigned at the below listed number.

Respectfully submitted,



Dated: June 3, 2008

Gerald T Shekleton

Reg. No. 27,466

WELSH & KATZ, LTD.

120 South Riverside Plaza, 22nd Floor

Chicago, Illinois 60606

Phone: (312) 655-1511

Fax: (312) 655-1501